UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,927	06/27/2003	Vineet Gupta	0026-0153	8649

44989 7590 09/28/2006	**EXAMINER**
HARRITY SNYDER, LLP	EBIRIM, EMEKA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

HARRITY SNYDER, LLP
11350 Random Hills Road
SUITE 600
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 June 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-89* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-89* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Status

1.   This communication is responsive to the Amendments filed on June 30, 2006.

The application has been fully examined and claims 1-89 are rejected and are pending

in this Office Action.

Response to Arguments

<u>Specification</u>

2.   Applicant's amendments with respect to the specification of the present

application have been fully considered and it overcomes the objections as applied to the

specification. As such the examiner has withdrawn the objection.

<u>Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101</u>

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to the 101 rejection of the present application

have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Claims 1-11, 24-41, 60-68, 78 are

rejected because they are directed to a system, however all components are software

[page 8 lines10-12] and thus lacking the necessary hardware for any functionality to be

realized. These claims do not indicate use of hardware on which the software runs to

perform the steps recited in the body of the claim. Software or program can be stored

on a medium and/or executed by a computer. A useful, concrete, and tangible results

must be either specifically recited in the claim or flow inherently therefrom. To be useful

the claimed invention must establish a specific, substantial, and credible utility. To be

concrete the claimed invention must be able to produce reproducible results. .To be

tangible the claimed invention must produce must produce a practical application or real
world result. As such, the claims are not limited to statutory subject matter and are
therefore non-statutory. Rejections as applied under 101 is hereby sustained.

Double Patenting

4.   With respect to claims 1,2, 7-9, 11-13, 17-20, 22-26, 28-32, 36-45, 47-50, 53-61,
and 64-78,applicants' argue that the Examiner does not make clear the differences
between the inventions defined by the conflicting claims",

In response to that, the Examiner reminds the applicant of the reason given in
the first Office action which says, that although the conflicting claims are not identical,
they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims of instant Application
No 10/607,927 are essentially the same as claims of copending Application No
10/407,476 except that it recites "preferred country" in place of preferred language.

The office Action further states that It would have been obvious to a person of
ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to substitute "language"
with "country" because selecting (triggering) the use of a "language" is similar to the use
of "country" [see Pub No: US 2003/0191817 to Justin Fidler].

Applicant argues, "Fidler fails to equate the terms 'language' and 'country'".

In response to this argument, Fidler discloses it as "In an embodiment of the
present invention, triggering of use of a particular language operates through the use of
a variable that is linked to an NLS format, as is known in the art. NLS is a convention for
naming language, similar to International Standards Organization (ISO) codes for

countries, in which a two letter code is used for each language." As such the recited process of language selection can be applied to that of county selection.

For the above reasons, the examiner believes that rejection of the last Office action was proper as applied under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1, 2, 7-9, 11-13, 17-20, 22-26, 28-32, 36-45, 47-50, 53-61, and 64-78 as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4, 9-12, 15, 21-25, 27, 28, 30, 35-39, 41-43, 47, 48, 50-53, 58, 60-66, 70-71, 73-75, 80-83, 86, 87, 89, 90, 92-95, and 98-100 of co-pending Application No. 10/407,476. The examiner respectfully traverses applicant's arguments. And as such rejections as applied to the last Office action are hereby sustained.

The examiner recognizes the nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-78 of the present application have been fully considered but are not persuasive. The examiner respectfully traverses applicant's arguments.

Applicant asserts that the examiner's use of obviousness-type double patenting rejection is an admission by the examiner that "Lamping et al. does not disclose a 'preferred country'" This conclusion is incorrect because the examiner did not use Lamping et al. in the double patenting rejection.

With respect to claim 1 the applicants arguments that "the word 'country' is only mentioned once in Lamping et al. (e.g. paragraph 81), and does not equate the terms 'languages' and 'country'". And as such claim 1 cannot be disclosed by the reference.

In response to applicant's argument, Lamping et al discloses that to determine a preferred language, a country or location is first determined, " a language preference might still be determinable based on information available in the URL 68 and the client location. The location of the IP domain identified in the URL 68 is determined (block 132). For example, a URL 68 specified as "www.acme.at" has an IP domain of ".at," which indicates an Austrian IP domain. ... If the URL 68 provides a useful IP domain (block 133), the languages of the country to which the IP domain is assigned is determined (block 134) and returned (135). If not useful (block 133), the location of the client 12 from which the search query 36 was sent is determine (block 136) by evaluating a Client_IP parameter, which can be parsed from the header of the Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) packet within which the search query 36 was sent"

[Para 0081, Fig 9]. These locations are not randomly chosen but are rather locations

(country) of interest (preference). Furthermore, the cited sections (in the first office

Action) of Lamping et al further help to fully disclose claim 1.

Claim 2-11 depend from claim 1 and the rejections as applied to these individual

claims in the first office action still applies to them.

With regards to claim 12, the applicant continues to assert that the examiner

concluded that, "Lamping et al. only discloses use of language, as admitted by the

Examiner".

In response to the above argument, the Examiner notes that the applicant has

failed to provide where this admission was made.

Applicant further agues in claim 12 that "the word 'country' is only mentioned

once in Lamping et al. (e.g. paragraph 81), and this document does not equate the

terms 'languages' and 'country'". And as such claim 12 cannot be disclosed by the

reference.

In response to applicant's argument, Lamping et al discloses that to determine a

preferred language, a country or location is first determined, " a language preference

might still be determinable based on information available in the URL 68 and the client

location. The location of the IP domain identified in the URL 68 is determined (block

132). For example, a URL 68 specified as "www.acme.at" has an IP domain of ".at,"

which indicates an Austrian IP domain. ... If the URL 68 provides a useful IP domain

(block 133), the languages of the country to which the IP domain is assigned is

determined (block 134) and returned (135). If not useful (block 133), the location of the

client 12 from which the search query 36 was sent is determine (block 136) by

evaluating a Client_IP parameter, which can be parsed from the header of the

Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) packet within which the search query 36 was sent"

[Para 0081]. These locations are not randomly chosen but are rather locations (country)

of interest (preference). Furthermore, the cited sections (in the first office Action) of

Lamping et al further help to fully disclose claim 12.

With regards to claim 24, the applicant continues to assert that the examiner

concluded that, "Lamping et al. only discloses use of language, as admitted by the

Examiner".

In response to the above argument, the Examiner notes that the applicant has

failed to provide where this admission was made.

Applicant further agues in claim 24 that "the word 'country' is only mentioned

once in Lamping et al. (e.g. paragraph 81), and this document does not equate the

terms 'languages' and 'country'". And as such claim 24 cannot be disclosed by the

reference.

In response to applicant's argument, Lamping et al discloses that to determine a

preferred language, a country or location is first determined, " a language preference

might still be determinable based on information available in the URL 68 and the client

location. The location of the IP domain identified in the URL 68 is determined (block

132). For example, a URL 68 specified as "www.acme.at" has an IP domain of ".at,"

which indicates an Austrian IP domain. ... If the URL 68 provides a useful IP domain

(block 133), the languages of the country to which the IP domain is assigned is

determined (block 134) and returned (135). If not useful (block 133), the location of the

client 12 from which the search query 36 was sent is determine (block 136) by

evaluating a Client_IP parameter, which can be parsed from the header of the

Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) packet within which the search query 36 was sent"

[Para 0081]. These locations are not randomly chosen but are rather locations (country)

of interest (preference). Furthermore, the cited sections (in the first office Action) of

Lamping et al further help to fully disclose claim 24.

With regards to claim 25, the applicant continues to assert that the examiner

concluded that, "Lamping et al. only discloses use of language, as admitted by the

Examiner".

In response to the above argument, the Examiner notes that the applicant has

failed to provide where this admission was made.

Applicant further agues in claim 25 that "the word 'country' is only mentioned

once in Lamping et al. (e.g. paragraph 81), and this document does not equate the

terms 'languages' and 'country'". And as such claim 25 cannot be disclosed by the

reference.

In response to applicant's argument, Lamping et al discloses that to determine a

preferred language, a country or location is first determined, " a language preference

might still be determinable based on information available in the URL 68 and the client

location. The location of the IP domain identified in the URL 68 is determined (block

132). For example, a URL 68 specified as "www.acme.at" has an IP domain of ".at,"

which indicates an Austrian IP domain. ... If the URL 68 provides a useful IP domain

(block 133), the languages of the country to which the IP domain is assigned is determined (block 134) and returned (135). If not useful (block 133), the location of the client 12 from which the search query 36 was sent is determine (block 136) by evaluating a Client_IP parameter, which can be parsed from the header of the Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) packet within which the search query 36 was sent" [Para 0081]. These locations are not randomly chosen but are rather locations (country) of interest (preference). Furthermore, the cited sections (in the first office Action) of Lamping et al further help to fully disclose claim 25.

With regards to claim 42, the applicant continues to assert that the examiner concluded that, "Lamping et al. only discloses use of language, as admitted by the Examiner".

In response to the above argument, the Examiner notes that the applicant has failed to provide where this admission was made.

Applicant further agues in claim 42 that "the word 'country' is only mentioned once in Lamping et al. (e.g. paragraph 81), and this document does not equate the terms 'languages' and 'country'". And as such claim 42 cannot be disclosed by the reference.

In response to applicant's argument, Lamping et al discloses that to determine a preferred language, a country or location is first determined, " a language preference might still be determinable based on information available in the URL 68 and the client location. The location of the IP domain identified in the URL 68 is determined (block 132). For example, a URL 68 specified as "www.acme.at" has an IP domain of ".at,"

which indicates an Austrian IP domain. ... If the URL 68 provides a useful IP domain (block 133), the languages of the country to which the IP domain is assigned is determined (block 134) and returned (135). If not useful (block 133), the location of the client 12 from which the search query 36 was sent is determine (block 136) by evaluating a Client_IP parameter, which can be parsed from the header of the Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) packet within which the search query 36 was sent" [Para 0081]. These locations are not randomly chosen but are rather locations (country) of interest (preference). Furthermore, the cited sections (in the first office Action) of Lamping et al further help to fully disclose claim 42.

With regards to claim 60, the applicant continues to assert that the examiner concluded that, "Lamping et al. only discloses use of language, as admitted by the Examiner".

In response to the above argument, the Examiner notes that the applicant has failed to provide where this admission was made.

Applicant further agues in claim 60 that "the word 'country' is only mentioned once in Lamping et al. (e.g. paragraph 81), and this document does not equate the terms 'languages' and 'country'". And as such claim 60 cannot be disclosed by the reference.

In response to applicant's argument, Lamping et al discloses that to determine a preferred language, a country or location is first determined, " a language preference might still be determinable based on information available in the URL 68 and the client location. The location of the IP domain identified in the URL 68 is determined (block

132). For example, a URL 68 specified as "www.acme.at" has an IP domain of ".at,"

which indicates an Austrian IP domain. ... If the URL 68 provides a useful IP domain

(block 133), the languages of the country to which the IP domain is assigned is

determined (block 134) and returned (135). If not useful (block 133), the location of the

client 12 from which the search query 36 was sent is determine (block 136) by

evaluating a Client_IP parameter, which can be parsed from the header of the

Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) packet within which the search query 36 was sent"

[Para 0081]. These locations are not randomly chosen but are rather locations (country)

of interest (preference). Furthermore, the cited sections (in the first office Action) of

Lamping et al further help to fully disclose claim 60.

With regards to claim 61, the applicant continues to assert that the examiner

concluded that, "Lamping et al. only discloses use of language, as admitted by the

Examiner".

In response to the above argument, the Examiner notes that the applicant has

failed to provide where this admission was made.

Applicant further agues in claim 61 that "the word 'country' is only mentioned

once in Lamping et al. (e.g. paragraph 81), and this document does not equate the

terms 'languages' and 'country'". And as such claim 61 cannot be disclosed by the

reference.

In response to applicant's argument, Lamping et al discloses that to determine a

preferred language, a country or location is first determined, " a language preference

might still be determinable based on information available in the URL 68 and the client

location. The location of the IP domain identified in the URL 68 is determined (block 132). For example, a URL 68 specified as "www.acme.at" has an IP domain of ".at," which indicates an Austrian IP domain. ... If the URL 68 provides a useful IP domain (block 133), the languages of the country to which the IP domain is assigned is determined (block 134) and returned (135). If not useful (block 133), the location of the client 12 from which the search query 36 was sent is determine (block 136) by evaluating a Client_IP parameter, which can be parsed from the header of the Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) packet within which the search query 36 was sent" [Para 0081]. These locations are not randomly chosen but are rather locations (country) of interest (preference). Furthermore, the cited sections (in the first office Action) of Lamping et al further help to fully disclose claim 61.

With regards to claim 69, the applicant continues to assert that the examiner concluded that, "Lamping et al. only discloses use of language, as admitted by the Examiner".

In response to the above argument, the Examiner notes that the applicant has failed to provide where this admission was made.

Applicant further agues in claim 69 that "the word 'country' is only mentioned once in Lamping et al. (e.g. paragraph 81), and this document does not equate the terms 'languages' and 'country'". And as such claim 69 cannot be disclosed by the reference.

In response to applicant's argument, Lamping et al discloses that to determine a preferred language, a country or location is first determined, " a language preference

might still be determinable based on information available in the URL 68 and the client

location. The location of the IP domain identified in the URL 68 is determined (block

132). For example, a URL 68 specified as "www.acme.at" has an IP domain of ".at,"

which indicates an Austrian IP domain. ... If the URL 68 provides a useful IP domain

(block 133), the languages of the country to which the IP domain is assigned is

determined (block 134) and returned (135). If not useful (block 133), the location of the

client 12 from which the search query 36 was sent is determine (block 136) by

evaluating a Client_IP parameter, which can be parsed from the header of the

Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) packet within which the search query 36 was sent"

[Para 0081]. These locations are not randomly chosen but are rather locations (country)

of interest (preference). Furthermore, the cited sections (in the first office Action) of

Lamping et al further help to fully disclose claim 69.

With regards to claim 78, the applicant continues to assert that the examiner

concluded that, "Lamping et al. only discloses use of language, as admitted by the

Examiner".

In response to the above argument, the Examiner notes that the applicant has

failed to provide where this admission was made.

Applicant further agues in claim 78 that "the word 'country' is only mentioned

once in Lamping et al. (e.g. paragraph 81), and this document does not equate the

terms 'languages' and 'country'". And as such claim 78 cannot be disclosed by the

reference.

In response to applicant's argument, Lamping et al discloses that to determine a preferred language, a country or location is first determined, " a language preference might still be determinable based on information available in the URL 68 and the client location. The location of the IP domain identified in the URL 68 is determined (block 132). For example, a URL 68 specified as "www.acme.at" has an IP domain of ".at," which indicates an Austrian IP domain. ... If the URL 68 provides a useful IP domain (block 133), the languages of the country to which the IP domain is assigned is determined (block 134) and returned (135). If not useful (block 133), the location of the client 12 from which the search query 36 was sent is determine (block 136) by evaluating a Client_IP parameter, which can be parsed from the header of the Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) packet within which the search query 36 was sent" [Para 0081]. These locations are not randomly chosen but are rather locations (country) of interest (preference). Furthermore, the cited sections (in the first office Action) of Lamping et al further help to fully disclose claim 78.

5.   For the above reasons, Examiner believed that rejection of the last Office action was proper. From the foregoing applicants have not met the requirements needed to traverse the rejections made to this application under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) to claims 1-78. And as such rejections as applied to the last Office action are hereby sustained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows: ·

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7.   Claims 1-11, 24-41, 60-68, 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the

claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-11, 24-41, 60-68, 78 are directed to a system, however all components are

software [page 8 lines10-12] and thus lacking the necessary hardware for any

functionality to be realized. It is as such non-statutory.

Double Patenting

8. ·   The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).
        A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.
        Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a
        terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply
        with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9.   Claims 1,2, 7-9, 11-13, 17-20, 22-26, 28-32, 36-45, 47-50, 53-61, 64-78, are

provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting

as being unpatentable over claims 1,4,9-12,15,15,21-25,27,28, 30,35-39, 41-43, 47,48,

50-53, 58,60-66, 70-71,73-75, 80-83, 86,87, 89,90,92-95, 98-100 of copending

Application No. 10407476.

10.   The following table shows the claims in Instant Application No: 10/607,927 that

are rejected by corresponding claims in Application No: 10/407,476.

Claims Comparison Table

Instant application No 10/607,927	Application No: 10/407,476
Claim 1	Claim 1
Claim 2	Claim 4
Claim 7	Claim 9
Claim 8	Claim 10
Claim 9	Claim 11
Claim 11	Claim 12
Claim 12	Claim 14
Claim 13	Claim 15
Claim 17	Claim 21
Claim 18	Claim 22
Claim 19	Claim 23
Claim 20	Claim 24
Claim 22	Claim 25
Claim 23	Claim 27
Claim 24	Claim 100

Claim 25	Claim 28
Claim 26	Claim 30
Claim 28	Claim 35
Claim 29	Claim 36
Claim 30	Claim 37
Claim 31	Claim 38
Claim 32	Claim 39
Claim 36	Claim 41
Claim 37	Claim 42
Claim 38	Claim 43
Claim 39	Claim 47
Claim 40	Claim 48
Claim 41	Claim 50
Claim 42	Claim 51
Claim 43	Claim 53
Claim 44	Claim 89
Claim 45	Claim 58
Claim 47	Claim 60
Claim 48	Claim 61
Claim 49	Claim 62
Claim 50	Claim 63

Claim 53	Claim 64
Claim 54	Claim 65
Claim 55	Claim 66
Claim 56	Claim 70
Claim 57	Claim 71
Claim 58	Claim 73
Claim 59	Claim 74
Claim 60	Claim 51,100
Claim 61	Claim 75
Claim 64	Claim 80
Claim 65	Claim 81
Claim 66	Claim 82
Claim 67	Claim 83
Claim 68	Claim 86
Claim 69	Claim 87
Claim 70	Claim 90
Claim 71	Claim 89
Claim 72	Claim 92
Claim 73	Claim 93
Claim 74	Claim 94
Claim 75	Claim 95

Claim 76	Claim 98
Claim 77	Claim 99
Claim 78	Claim 100

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims of instant Application No 10/607,927 are essentially the same as claims of copending Application No 10/407,476 except that it recites "preferred country".

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to substitute "language" with "country" because selecting (triggering) the use of a "language" is similar to the use of "country" [see Pub No: US 2003/0191817 to Justin Fidler]

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

11.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

12.   Claims 1-11, 24-41, 60-68, 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-11, 24-41, 60-68, 78 are directed to a system, however all components

are software [page 8 lines10-12] and thus lacking the necessary hardware for any

functionality to be realized it is as such non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

14.   Claims 1-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pub No:

2004/0194099 to Lamping et al (hereinafter Lamping).

Claim 1.

Lamping discloses:

A system for ordering search results, comprising:

a country selector dynamically determining at least one preferred country

applicable to search results generated responsive to a search query executed on

potentially retrievable information and provided in a plurality of search result countries;

and [selector, country, search result, potentially retrievable, see Lamping paragraph

0017, 0043, 0081, Fig 9]

a search result orderer ordering at least some of the search results based on the at least one preferred country. [ordering, country, search result, preferred, see Lamping paragraph 0017, 0043, 0081, Fig 9]

Claim 2.

.   Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 1, further comprising:

an interface characterizer determining the at least one preferred country using interface characteristics. [country, interface characteristics, see Lamping paragraph 0077, 0081]

Claim 3.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 2, wherein the interface characteristics comprise at least one country accepted by the user interface. [country, interface characteristics, see Lamping paragraph 0077, 0081]

Claim 4.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 1, further comprising:

an IP characterizer determining the at least one preferred country using IP characteristics. [country, IP, see Lamping paragraph 0077, 0081]

Claim 5.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 4, wherein the IP characteristics comprise a network

address of a client application from which the search query was submitted [IP address

(network address), see Lamping paragraph, 0081].

Claim 6.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 1, further comprising:

an indexer ranking the search results [ranking, see Lamping paragraph 0082];

and

the search result orderer ordering at least some of the ranked search results

relative to the at least one preferred country. [order, search result, country, see Lamping

paragraph 0067, 0082, 0081]

Claim 7.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 6, further comprising at least one of:

the search result orderer demoting each search result in a country other than the

at least one preferred country and promoting each search result in the at least one

preferred country by at least one position [demote, country, see Lamping paragraph

0047, 0081, Fig 9]; and

the search result orderer promoting each search result in a country other than the

at least one preferred country and demoting each search result in the at least one

preferred country by at least one position. [orderer, promoter, country, see Lamping

paragraph 0043, 0081, Fig 9];

Claim 8.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 1, further comprising:

a scorer assigning a numerical score to the search results [scorer, see Lamping

paragraph 0045]; and

the search result orderer adjusting the numerical score of at least some of the

search results in the at least one preferred country [orderer, scorer, see Lamping

paragraph 0043, 0045].

Claim 9.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 8, further comprising at least one of:

the search result orderer increasing the numerical score assigned to the search

results in the at least one preferred country and maintaining the numerical score

assigned to the search results in a country other than the at least one preferred country; and [country, orderer, scorer, see Lamping paragraph 0043, 0045, 0081].

the search result orderer decreasing the numerical score assigned to the search results in the at least one preferred country and maintaining the numerical score assigned to the search results in a country other than the at least one preferred country [country, orderer, scorer, see Lamping paragraph 0043, 0045, 0081].

Claim 10.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 8, further comprising:

a country selector including one or more related, alternate and less preferred countries in the at least one preferred country [country, selector, less preferred, see Lamping paragraph 0043, 0081]; and

the search result orderer adjusting the numerical score, comprising at least one of increasing the numerical score assigned to the search results in the one or more related, alternate and less preferred countries and maintaining the numerical score assigned to the search results in a country other than the at least one preferred country, and decreasing the numerical score assigned to the search results in the one or more related, alternate and less preferred countries and maintaining the numerical score assigned to the search results in a country other than the at least one preferred country. [country, increase, decrease, numerical score, see Lamping paragraph 0048, 0081]

Claim 11.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 1, further comprising:

the search result orderer sorting at least some of the search results with adjusted

numerical scores. [resorting, numerical score, see Lamping paragraph 0015]

Claim 12.

Lamping discloses:

A method for ordering search results, comprising:

dynamically determining at least one preferred country applicable to search

results generated responsive to a search executed on potentially retrievable information

and provided in a plurality of search result countries [country, search result, potentially

retrievable, see Lamping paragraph 0017, 0043, 0081, Fig 9]; and

ordering at least some of the search results based on the at least one preferred

country. [ordering, country, search result, preferred, see Lamping paragraph 0017,

0043, 0081, Fig 9]

Claim 13.

Lamping discloses:

A method according to claim 12, further comprising:

determining the at least one preferred country using interface characteristics.

[country, preferred, see Lamping paragraph 0077, 0081]

Claim 14.

Lamping discloses:

A method according to claim 13, wherein the interface characteristics comprise at least one country accepted by the user interface. [country, interface characteristics, see Lamping paragraph 0077, 0081]

Claim 15.

Lamping discloses:

A method according to claim 12, further comprising:

determining the at least one preferred country using IP characteristics. [IP parameter, country, see Lamping paragraph 0081]

Claim 16.

Claim 16 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 5 hereinabove.

Claim 17.

Claim 17 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 6 hereinabove.

Claim 18.

Claim 18 is essentially the same as claim 7 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 7 hereinabove.

Claim 19.

Claim 19 is essentially the same as claim 8 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 8 hereinabove.

Claim 20.

Claim 20 is essentially the same as claim 9 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 9 hereinabove.

Claim 21.

Lamping discloses:

A method according to claim 19, further comprising:

including one or more related, alternate and less preferred countries in the at least one preferred country [preferred, country, see Lamping paragraph 0081] ; and

adjusting the numerical score, comprising at least one of [adjusting the numerical score, see Lamping paragraph 0015]:

increasing the numerical score assigned to the search results in the one or more related, alternate and less preferred countries and maintaining the numerical score

assigned to the search results in a country other than the at least one preferred country [increase numerical score, country see Lamping paragraph 0048, 0081]; and

decreasing the numerical score assigned to the search results in the one or more related, alternate and less preferred countries and maintaining the numerical score assigned to the search results in a country other than the at least one preferred country [decrease numerical score, country see Lamping paragraph 0048, 0081].

Claim 22.

Claim 22 is essentially the same as claim 11 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 11 hereinabove.

Claim 23.

Lamping discloses:

A computer-readable storage medium holding code for performing the method according to claim 12 [computer-readable storage, see Lamping paragraph 0038].

Claim 24.

Claim 24 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it recites "apparatus". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 1 hereinabove.

Claim 25.

Lamping discloses:

A system for providing preferred country ordering of search results, comprising:

a parser receiving a search query describing potentially retrievable information provided in a plurality of search result countries [parser, country, see Lamping paragraph 0040, 0081];

an indexer executing a search by evaluating the search query against information characteristics maintained in a searchable data repository [indexer, see Lamping paragraph 0041]; and

a country promoter dynamically determining at least one preferred country applicable to search results generated responsive to the executed search, and ordering at least some of the search results based on the at least one preferred country [promoter, country, see Lamping paragraph 0041, 0081].

Claim 26.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 25, further comprising:

a user interface characterizer determining a country accepted by a user interface [user interface characteristics, see Lamping paragraph 0015, 0046, 0081]; and

a country selector selecting the country as the at least one preferred country [selector, country, see Lamping paragraph, 0043, 0081].

Claim 27.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 25, further comprising:

an Internet Protocol (IP) characterizer determining a country based on a network address of a client application from which the search query was submitted [IP, determine country see Lamping paragraph 0081]; and

a country selector selecting the country as the at least one preferred country [selector, country see Lamping paragraph 0043, 0081].

Claim 28.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 25, further comprising:

a search result orderer ordering the search results based on a match of a country of the search results to the at least one preferred country [order, match, country see Lamping paragraph 0067, 0068, 0081].

Claim 29.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 25, further comprising: a search result orderer ordering the search results by degree of match of a country of the search results to the at least one preferred country [degree, order, match, country, see Lamping paragraph 0067, 0068, 0081].

Claim 30.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 29, further comprising:

the search result orderer demoting the search results in a country other than the

at least one preferred country by a predefined shifting factor [demote, shifting factor,

country, see Lamping paragraph 0047, 0081].

Claim 31.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 30, wherein the predefined factor substantially

equals two (2.0) [shifting factor, country, see Lamping paragraph 0047].

Claim 32.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 29, further comprising:

the search result orderer promoting the search results in a country other than the

at least one preferred country by a predefined shifting factor. [promote, shifting factor,

country, see Lamping paragraph 0047, 0081].

Claim 33.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 25, further comprising:

a scorer ordering each of the search results by degree of match to the

information characteristics. [scorer, degree, match, country, see Lamping paragraph

0047, 0045].

Claim 34.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 25, further comprising:

a country detector detecting a country associated with at least one search result

[identify (detect), search results, country see Lamping paragraph 0042, 0081].

Claim 35.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 34, further comprising at least one of:

a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) analyzer determining a URL extension for the

at least one search result [identify (Uniform Resource Locator (URL) see Lamping

paragraph 0054, 0081];

a domain registrar examiner examining a domain registrar address for the at

least one search result and inferring the country from a business associated therewith

[see Lamping paragraph 0081];

a country inferrer inferring the country from at least one of the IP address of a

Web server from which the search result was obtained, a search result document for the

at least one search result, or other Web pages on a same Web site as the at least one

search result [see Lamping paragraph, 0081]; and

a hyperlink analyzer examining anchor text of hyperlinks to the search result

document, text near the hyperlinks, or countries of the Web pages with hyperlinks to the

search result document [country, hyperlink, see Lamping paragraph 0041, 0081].

Claim 36.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 25, wherein the search results are assigned a

numerical score, further comprising:

a search result orderer increasing the numerical score assigned to at least some

of the search results in the at least one preferred country [country, numerical score,

search results, increase, see Lamping paragraph 0089, 0081].

Claim 37.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 36, wherein the numerical score is adjusted in accordance with the formula:

$$s\,i = (s\,i + 1)/\,2$$

where si comprises the numerical score for each search result i.

[see Lamping paragraph 0048, Fig 12 (174)]

Claim 38.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 36, wherein the search results are assigned a numerical score, further comprising:

a search result orderer decreasing the numerical score assigned to at least some of the search results in the at least one preferred country [country, numerical score, search results, decrease, see Lamping paragraph 0089, 0081].

Claim 39.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 25, further comprising:

a presenter presenting the search results. [see Lamping paragraph 0052]

Claim 40.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 39, further comprising:

the presenter performing at least one of controlling enablement of presentation of at least some of the search results for each of the at least one preferred country, grouping together at least some of the search results for each of the at least one preferred country and arranging at least some of the search results for each of the at least one preferred country next to at least some of the search results for at least one country other than the at least one preferred countries prior to presentation to the user. [see Lamping paragraph 0052, 0081]

Claim 41.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 25, further comprising:

a country selector including one or more related, alternate and less preferred countries in the at least one preferred country [country, selector, less preferred, see Lamping paragraph 0043, 0081].

Claim 42.

Claim 42 is essentially the same as claim 25 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 25 hereinabove.

Claim 43.

Claim 43 is essentially the same as claim 26 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 26 hereinabove.

Claim 44.

Claim 44 is essentially the same as claim 27 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 27 hereinabove.

Claim 45.

Claim 45 is essentially the same as claim 28 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 28 hereinabove.

Claim 46.

Claim 46 is essentially the same as claim 29 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 29 hereinabove.

Claim 47.

Claim 47 is essentially the same as claim 30 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 30 hereinabove.

Claim 48.

Claim 48 is essentially the same as claim 31 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 31 hereinabove.

Claim 49.

Claim 49 is essentially the same as claim 32 except that it recites "method". It is

rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 32 hereinabove.

Claim 50.

Claim 50 is essentially the same as claim 33 except that it recites "method". It is

rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 33 hereinabove.

Claim 51.

Claim 51 is essentially the same as claim 34 except that it recites "method". It is

rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 34 hereinabove.

Claim 52.

Claim 52 is essentially the same as claim 35 except that it recites "method". It is

rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 35 hereinabove.

Claim 53.

Claim 53 is essentially the same as claim 36 except that it recites "method". It is

rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 36 hereinabove.

Claim 54.

Claim 54 is essentially the same as claim 37 except that it recites "method". It is

rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 37 hereinabove.

Claim 55.

Claim 55 is essentially the same as claim 38 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 38 hereinabove.

Claim 56.

Claim 56 is essentially the same as claim 39 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 39 hereinabove..

Claim 57.

Claim 57 is essentially the same as claim 40 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 40 hereinabove..

Claim 58.

Claim 58 is essentially the same as claim 41 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 41 hereinabove.

Claim 59.

Lamping discloses:

A computer-readable storage medium holding code for performing the method according to claim 42 [computer-readable storage, see Lamping paragraph 0038].

Claim 60.

Claim 60 is essentially the same as claim 25 except that it recites "apparatus". It
is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 25 hereinabove.

Claim 61.

Lamping discloses:

A system for dynamically determining country preferences and ordering of search
results, comprising [ordering, country, search result, preferred, see Lamping paragraph
0017, 0043, 0081]:

a parser receiving a search query request message and parsing at least one of
terms and attributes from the search query request message to identify potentially
retrievable Web content provided in a plurality of search result countries [parser, web
content, search query, see Lamping paragraph 0040];

an indexer executing a search by evaluating the at least one of terms and
attributes against information characteristics maintained in a searchable data repository
and generating search results responsive to the executed search [indexer, see Lamping
paragraph 0041];

a country promoter determining at least one preferred country, comprising
[promoter, country, see Lamping paragraph 0043, 0081]:

a country determiner evaluating characteristics of at least one of the user
interface and the Internet Protocol (IP), and selecting the at least one preferred country
based on the evaluated characteristics [see Lamping paragraph 0081];

a country orderer ordering at least some of the search results based on the at
least one preferred country [country, order, search results, see Lamping paragraph
0081, 0068]; and

a presenter presenting the search results as search result response messages.
[see Lamping paragraph 0052]

Claim 62.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 61, wherein evaluating the user interface further
comprises:

a user interface characterizer determining at least one country accepted by the
user interface. [country, user interface characteristics, see Lamping paragraph 0015,
0046, 0077, 0081]

Claim 63.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 61, wherein evaluating the IP characteristics further
comprises:

an Internet Protocol (IP) characterizer determining a network address of a client

application from which the search query request message was submitted. [Internet

protocol, determine, address, see Lamping paragraph 0081]

Claim 64.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 61, wherein the search results are generated in a

ranked order, further comprising [rank, order, search result, see Lamping paragraph

0083, 0084]:

a search result orderer ordering at least some of the search results relative to the

at least one preferred country by a predefined shifting factor, comprising at least one of

demoting each such search result in a country other than the at least one preferred

country by the predefined shifting factor and promoting each such search result in the at

least one preferred country by at least one position, and promoting each such search

result in a country other than the at least one preferred country by the predefined

shifting factor and demoting each such search result in the at least one preferred

country by at least one position. [rank, order, shifting factor, promote, demote, see

Lamping paragraph 0083, 0084]

Claim 65.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 64, further comprising:

the search result orderer adjusting the predefined shifting factor based on

available context in the search query request message and the search results. [order,

shifting factor, search result, search query, see Lamping paragraph 0083, 0084]

Claim 66.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 61, wherein the search results are generated in a

ranked order by numerical score, further comprising:

the search result orderer adjusting the numerical score of at least some of the

search results by a predetermined weighting factor comprising at least one of increasing

the numerical score assigned to the search results in the at least one preferred country

and maintaining the numerical score assigned to the search results in a country other

than the at least one preferred country, and decreasing the numerical score assigned to

the search results in the at least one preferred country and maintaining the numerical

score assigned to the search results in a country other than the at least one preferred

country. [adjust, numerical score, weighting factor, see Lamping paragraph 0083, 0084]

Claim 67.

Lamping discloses:

A system according to claim 66, further comprising:

the search result orderer adjusting the predefined weighting factor based on

available context in the search query request message and the search results [adjust,

numerical score, weighting factor, see Lamping paragraph 0083, 0084].

Claim 68.

A system according to claim 61, wherein the search query request message and

each search result response message is HTTP-compliant. [HTTP-compliant, see

Lamping paragraph 0068]

Claim 69.

Claim 69 is essentially the same as claim 61 except that it recites "method". It is

rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 61 hereinabove.

Claim 70.

Claim 70 is essentially the same as claim 62 except that it recites "method". It is

rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 62 hereinabove.

Claim 71.

Claim 71 is essentially the same as claim 63 except that it recites "method". It is

rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 63 hereinabove.

Claim 72.

Claim 72 is essentially the same as claim 64 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 64 hereinabove.

Claim 73.

Claim 74 is essentially the same as claim 65 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 65 hereinabove.

Claim 74.

Claim 74 is essentially the same as claim 66 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 66 hereinabove.

Claim 75.

Claim 75 is essentially the same as claim 67 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 67 hereinabove.

Claim 76.

Claim 76 is essentially the same as claim 68 except that it recites "method". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 68 hereinabove.

Claim 77.

Lamping discloses:

A computer-readable storage medium holding code for performing the method according to claim 69. [computer-readable storage, see Lamping paragraph 0038]

Claim 78.

Claim 78 is essentially the same as claim 69 except that it recites "apparatus". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 69 hereinabove.

Claim 79 (new).

Lamping discloses:

A method comprising:

executing a search in response to a search query to generate search results [execute search, search result, Para 0007, Fig 3, 6];

ordering the search results based on a degree of match with the search query [order search results, Fig 6 (83), Para 0067];

dynamically determining a preferred country [Determine location (country), Para 0081, Fig 9 (132-139)]; and

reordering at least some of the search results based on the preferred country [ordering, country, search result, preferred, see Lamping paragraph 0017, 0043, 0081, Fig 9].

Claim 80. (new)

Lamping discloses the elements of claim 79 as above and furthermore it discloses, wherein the preferred country is determined based on an interface

characteristic comprising a country accepted by a user interface [country, interface

characteristics, see Lamping paragraph 0077, 0081].

Claim 81. (new)

Lamping discloses the elements of claim 79 as above and furthermore it

discloses, wherein the preferred country is determined based on an IP characteristic

comprising a network address of a client application from which the search query was

submitted [IP address (network address), see Lamping paragraph, 0081].

Claim 82. (new)

Lamping discloses the elements of claim 79 as above and furthermore it

discloses, wherein the preferred country is determined based on a user preference

comprising cookies received from a user interface [cookies, Para 0009, 0078].

Claim 83. (new)

Lamping discloses the elements of claim 79 as above and furthermore it

discloses: determining a country associated with each search result based on at least

one of a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) associated with each search result, a domain

register address associated with each search result, or an anchor text of a hyperlink

associated with each search result [URL, Para 81, Fig 9].

Claim 84. (new)

Lamping discloses the elements of claim 83 as above and furthermore it

discloses, wherein the at least some search results are reordered based on a degree of

match between the countries associated with the search results and the preferred

country [order search results, Fig 6 (83), Para 0067, 0081].

Claim 85. (new)

Lamping discloses the elements of claim 83 as above and furthermore it

discloses comprising at least one of:

demoting each search result associated with a country other than the preferred

country and promoting each search result associated with the preferred country

[demote, country, see Lamping paragraph 0047, 0081, Fig 9]; and

promoting each search result associated with a country other than the preferred

country and demoting each search result associated with the preferred country

[orderer, promoter, country, see Lamping paragraph 0043, 0081, Fig 9].

Claim 86. (new)

Lamping discloses the elements of claim 79 as above and furthermore it

discloses:

dynamically determining an alternate preferred country based on at least one of

interface characteristics, Internet Protocol (IP) characteristics, or user preferences

[country, search result, potentially retrievable, see Lamping paragraph 0017, 0043,

0081, Fig 9]; and

reordering at least some of the search results based on the alternate preferred

country [ordering, country, search result, preferred, see Lamping paragraph 0017,

0043, 0081, Fig 9].

Claim 87. (new)

Lamping discloses the elements of claim 86 as above and furthermore it

discloses, wherein the search results associated with the preferred country are provided

before the search results associated with the alternate preferred country [country, less

preferred, see Lamping paragraph 0043, 0081].

Claim 88. (new)

Lamping discloses:

A device comprising:

a memory to store a plurality of instructions [memory, Para 0037]; and

a processor to execute instructions in the memory to [processor, Para 0037]:

order search results based on a degree of match with a search query [ordering,

country, search result, preferred, see Lamping paragraph 0017, 0043, 0081, Fig 9],

dynamically determine a preferred country based on at least one of an interface

characteristic, an Internet Protocol (IP) characteristic, or a user preference [IP, country,

search result, potentially retrievable, see Lamping paragraph 0017, 0043, 0081, Fig 9],

and

reorder at least some of the search results based on the preferred country

[ordering, country, search result, preferred, see Lamping paragraph 0017, 0043, 0081,

Fig 9].

Claim 89. (new)

Claim 89 is essentially the same as claim 88 except that it recites "computer

readable medium". It is rejected for the same rational as applied to claims 88

hereinabove.

Conclusion

15.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

16.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Emeka Ebirim whose telephone number is 571-272-

3994. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30pm - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Name: Emeka Ebirim
Art Unit: 2166

KHANH B. PHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER